

Del Bland

May 31, 1991

Dear Del:

I have been in Europe and thus the delay in answering your letter of May 13, 1991.

I am glad that you feel that no problems have developed for you as to the missing U.S. cents. I hear they referred to you as Mr. Flak in Boston. The massive amount of complex work you did is respected and I understand you have revised a couple of findings as to the missing ANS cents. You indicated you gathered much new data at the EAC in Boston. I am hopeful that you will conclude to give ANS or us any further information which you have as to where the missing cents are.

I have been advised that EAC as an organization does not wish to be involved in the ANS problem. But I am most interested as to what, if anything, is published in Penny-Wise about it because in my opinion the membership should be informed of the events and problems. Do you agree?

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Del Bland

May 31, 1991

Dear Del:

As to your May 13, 1991 letter I only have the Newcomer Inventory of Colonial pieces as made by Mehl. It includes Fugios but no U.S. cents or half cents. I believe John Kleeberg did not know the limited extent of that inventory.

I think The Numismatist had an article on the Newcomer collection but I don't know its citation at this time.

Cordially,

Eric P. Newman

P.S. there are two Numismatist articles, Volume 44, p. 795; and Volume 48, p. 162, neither of which contains much substance, but we provide the citations for your convenience.

Mr. Del Bland

June 17, 1991

Dear Del:

Thank you for your June 12, 1991 letter. In the ANA Anthology the B. Max Mehl advertising indicates no inventory of the Newcomer Collection half cents or cents was made by Mehl. If any exists it would have been made by or for Newcomer himself as I believe the Colonial portion was too accurate for Mehl to have made.

As to the ANS Clapp cents I thank you for the information on the items which revise your original list. I understand you recently notified Kleeberg at ANS about it. I do however need a clarification of your comment "Have not located these. Expect many are in various collections or investors portfolios." This follows "the number of pilfered coins still remains at 129. " Do you mean you have not located the two coins you commented upon in detail or that you have not located any of the 129? I enclose a copy of your letter for your convenience.

As to the publication of your findings in **Penny-Wise**, I was satisfied that on second thought EAC would do so and I wrote EAC accordingly. This seems to be a change in position from what was said in its first letter to me. I hope it will contain the full listing or else it would not be informative.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

Del Bland

November 8, 1993

Dear Del:

Thank you very much for the photocopies of the listings of the number 1 collection and number 2 collection of Dorothy Paschal.

This might be helpful to ANS in trying to trace Clapp-ANS coins which were sold by Chatham for her to third parties.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated. Your records are amazing.

My best,

Eric P. Newman

Del Bland

September 19, 1997

Dear Del:

I was looking through my counterfeit US material and came across two 1793 Smith of Ann Street coins I had not seen in decades.

On examining them I was amazed to find that both were made from 1793 cents, not from 1794 as I previously had assumed.

The liberty cap undercoin I cannot identify and it could be a new variety but Smith was so clever I can't tell what he changed and what he didn't change.

I enclose pictures of the coins and my notations about them. Can you diagnose the liberty cap variety from which the coin I have originated.

That would be most helpful. If I should send the coin or both coins to you I will do so if that is desirable.

Thanks,

Eric P. Newman

Del Bland


September 29, 1997

Certified Mail

Dear Del:

As you requested I am enclosing for your study two Smith 1793 "altered" U.S. Cents. You already have my notations describing them.

The Liberty Cap cent I might have acquired as a genuine piece from William Hasslein, a Boston dealer, about 1930 for \$25. When I was told it was altered I tried to return it and get a refund but he disappeared. I then typed on my envelope that it was altered from a 1794 which is wrong. I learned a great lesson from that transaction.

The wreath cent I have had for over 50 years. Whether it came from the B.G. Johnson stock or from the Green collection I have no idea but I ended up with it as a worthless item for my large box of fakes.

I look forward to your opinion, particularly as to the undercoin for the 1793 Liberty Cap which mystifies me. Maybe I have a new variety.

If you take nice pictures please send me prints. Please return the coins after they have served your purpose.

My best to you,

Eric P. Newman

Del Bland

April 23, 1998

Dear Del:

You have already studied my Smith of Ann Street 1793 Liberty Cap cent alteration. I have worked on it further and I sent it to John Kleeberg. He feels it is S.18 based upon obverse features but cannot explain the features of the reverse. I am still puzzled.

I examined the ANS piece which is the only other piece I know of altered into a 1793 Liberty Cap and wonder if you know of any others.

The ANS piece has 121 dots on the obverse and 101 dots on the reverse. My piece has 112 dots on the obverse and 96 dots on the reverse. All known genuine 1793 Liberty Caps have 91, 94, 96 or 97 dots on the obverse and 85 or 91 dots on the reverse.

My piece has many unusual features to conceal its identity, particularly on the reverse. The M in AMERICA is very wide due to the angle of the second diagonal. The I and C are very far apart.

The top of each sprig has a single leaf, the cluster under O has three leaves. The tops of the two leaves to the right of the base of T in CENT are even with the base line of T and distant from T.

The center of the tops of the ribbon loops are horizontal. The lettering is distant for the border dots and the edges. The T of CENT is upright and its top is higher than the top of the adjacent N.

On the obverse the lower curl points downward. The double chin seems exactly like S.18 and S.19 and does not seem to have been tampered with. That feature seems diagnostic.

The lettered edge reads normally with the obverse on top.

Would you be nice enough to study the photograph of my piece again (for which I thank you) and see if you come to any further conclusions as to whether the undercoin is S.18 or S.19.

What a skillful, meticulous, deceiving artist Smith must have been.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman